

gists have especial reasons for figuring every shell described, inasmuch as that shell is not a complete organism, such as usually represents a species to an entomologist or an ichthyologist. If a carcinologist were required to name and describe a new crab from an empty carapace shorn of its appendages, or a botanist to publish a new tree from a handful of leaves, each would probably decline on the ground of insufficient material; and if he yielded, say to the impertunity of a palæontologist who could furnish nothing else, he would endeavour to make amends for his fragmentary material by figuring and describing it in the minutest detail.

To conclude: in the army of science there is no room between an honoured veteran like Mr. Smith and a tyro like myself for that green-eyed monster to whom he somewhat harshly alludes. The object of these remarks will have been attained if I can but induce European writers to read a little more Australian scientific literature, to study the geography of this continent with a little more care, and especially to figure every Australasian shell they describe as new.

Sydney, New South Wales,
November 30, 1895.

Reply.

I do not propose in any way to modify or withdraw the opinion expressed in the paragraph of my paper complained of by Mr. Hedley, who has, however, both *misunderstood* and *misrepresented* it. I make no general imputation against *all* Americans, as he infers, but, from my own experience and from the testimony of others, I have reason to know that a jealous feeling has been entertained by "some."

With regard to the title of Mr. Hedley's above remarks, I would observe that I have made no accusation at all against Australian writers, and my observation, "it seems almost as if the 'green-eyed monster' were tripping in the Antipodes," was a playful reference to Mr. Hedley alone, and was prompted by the general tone of his paper, which I thought might have been withheld until he had again occasion to deal with the fauna of New Guinea. I may add that if he had been a little less precipitate he would have been saved the trouble of writing his comments, for figures have since been published of the species complained of.

I may also say, in conclusion, that I do not think it would be edifying to further encroach upon the valuable space of these 'Annals' with a detailed criticism of the rest of Mr. Hedley's prolix remarks. A deal might be said with regard to the relative value of a good description and a bad figure, of the cost of illustration, of priority of publication, &c., but *cui bono*?
E. A. SMITH.

P.S.—Since penning the above reply specimens of Mr. Hedley's *Rhysota flyensis* (a synonym of which he complained of my creation in *R. Armiti*) have been added to the Museum collection. In my opinion it is *merely a variety* of his own *R. hercules*, described at the same time!—E. A. S.